UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Duty to Civilization (*Part V*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Victor Hugo

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

The Cry of Armenia

By DIANA AGABEG APCAR

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 15

Chicago, June 9, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 227
Duty to Civilization. V.—Francis Neilson 229

CONTRIBUTED—

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. III. Victor Hugo.—George Willis Cooke 234
The Spy System in Industry (Concluded).—Norman E. Himes 236
The Cry of Armenia.—Diana Agabeg Apcar 238

POETRY—

Gandhi.—Benjamin Collins Woodbury 227
The Watch.—*James Waldo Fawcett* 235

THE FIELD—

Rev. Robert Whitaker Resigns 239

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1921 NUMBER 15

GANDHI.

When shall there be again revealed a Saint,
A holy man, a Saviour of his race,
When shall the Christ once more reveal His face?
Gautama left his 'bode without complaint,
Till weary, hungered, desolate and faint
He sank beneath the bo-tree with his load,
As on the Path of solitude he strode;
And Jesus died to still the sinner's plaint.

Lives there a man as faithful to his vow?
Mahatma to a bonded race of men?
Aye, Gandhi seeks his nation's soul to free:
Unto the least, ye do it unto Me!
Hath Buddha found in peace Nirvana now;
Or doth a Christ walk on the earth again?

BENJAMIN COLLINS WOODBURY.

How constantly amusing are the newspapers! On Monday, May 30, in two of the New York papers, appeared the followig headlines:

(a) **HARDING OPPOSES HARVEY'S VIEWS ON OUR PART IN WAR**

We Joined in a "Supreme and Sublime Effort" for Civilization, He Says.

(b) **HARDING BACKS UP HARVEY IN LONDON SPEECH**

U. S. Entered War to Save Herself, and Not for Idealistic Purposes, He Tells Church Audience.

This is what, in our American innocence, we call "news"—not what happened, but what each newspaper desires that its readers shall imagine happened! In this case, however, it must be admitted that there was some excuse for the contradiction in headlines, for what the President said in his Pohick speech was this: "America fought to preserve the rights of the Republic, and to maintain the civilization which we had such a part in making." Devoid alike of ideas and policies, Mr. Harding solemnly endorses both theories as to why we went into the Great War, and leaves his hearers to accept whichever horn of the dilemma pleases them. In this the President holds fast to his well-won reputation for amiability. As to the facts—well, what difference does it make, after all? If we went into the war to save ourselves, selfishness was triumphant; if we went in to save others, unselfishness was betrayed. In both cases, the cause was unworthy, and brave men died in vain!

The Borah Amendment, calling for a conference between representatives of England, Japan and the United States, to the end of securing a reduction by mutual agreement of the armaments of these three countries, now holds the center of the stage in the absorbing drama of disarmament. The fact that this amendment to the Naval Appropriation Bill was adopted in the Senate by a unanimous vote, after its defeat had been officially forecasted, is impressive evidence of the potency of the public opinion that is rolling up behind the disarmament idea. The irony of the present situation—increased armies and navies as the direct consequence of a "war to end war," the horrors now definitely promised as the inevitable accompaniment of "the next war," the back-breaking burden of taxation laid on nations stricken with industrial depression and increasing unemployment, the certainty that preparedness for war does not prevent but immediately occasions war—all these and other grim corollaries of experience are beginning to sink in, and accomplish in a few weeks what pacifist arguments of even the most eloquent description could not accomplish in as many years. The victory, of course, is far from being won. The House of Representatives must be persuaded to accept the Amendment; then, if this is accomplished, President Harding must be moved to act upon the authorization given him. This last will be no easy task. But if the people weary not in their pressing of this issue, they cannot be resisted.

It is difficult to express the gratification we feel over Postmaster-General Hayes's action in granting second-class mailing privileges to Max Eastman's *Liberator,* and ordering a refund of $11,277 on account of excess charges involved in the use by that magazine of the third-class mails. There never was any sanity in Burleson's characteristically autocratic action in denying second-class rates to the *Liberator,* while permitting it to enjoy the much more expensive third-class rates. This was simply the deliberate attempt of an ignorant and ungenerous public official to force into bankruptcy a paper against which no legal charge of any kind could be brought, but with the opinions of which he didn't happen to agree. It was bureaucratic censorship of the worst description. This Mr. Hayes sees, and he ends it forthwith! There is no room in our government, he says, for tyranny of this description. If a paper is seditious, or is preaching force and violence, then it is the business of the Department of Justice to act "in the manner prescribed by law." The Post Office Department has nothing to do but to heed the decisions of the courts—"to bar prohibited matter entirely from the mails, and not simply exclude it from a

particular class of mail." This is a government, in other words, not of men but of laws! Reassertion of this basic democratic principle has been a long time in coming—but here it is at last! Let all true Americans rejoice!

There is no longer excuse for anybody's not having accurate information and right ideas about Russia. In the last few months have appeared a series of books written by competent and first-hand observers, which present the facts for all who are willing to receive them. Most important among these recent books are Bertrand Russell's "Bolshevism: Practice and Theory," George Lansbury's "What I Saw in Russia," Arthur Ransome's "The Crisis in Russia," H. G. Wells's "Russia in the Shadows," Mrs. Philip Snowden's "Through Bolshevik Russia," and Henry N. Brailsford's "The Russian Workers' Republic." To these might be added Mrs. Clare Sheridan's vivid diary of her experiences among the commissars of Moscow; and the official report of the British Labor Party delegation to Russia. These observers, it is to be noted, do not agree in their opinions about the Bolsheviki. Thus Bertrand Russell is sternly critical, while George Lansbury is naively eulogistic. But they agree to a remarkable extent on the facts of the situation, and in their final all-important judgment that the fate not only of Russia but of Europe depends upon the success of the Soviet regime in maintaining its power, and thereby holding Russian society together. After years of mystery, speculation and poisonous propaganda, it is a relief to have the veil lifted and the truth revealed.

An interesting sidelight on the situation in India, especially on certain aspects of Gandhi's movement, is shed by the announcement that the British Government is taking extreme measures against leaders who are teaching the people to abstain from alcohol and narcotic drugs. From the beginning Mahatma Gandhi has realized that the Indians must be physically and morally uplifted, if they are to make a success of the independence which they seek. He has projected into his movement, therefore, a program of "self-purification." His followers are pledged to refrain from all indulgence in liquors, morphine and hemp. As these followers are now numbered by the millions, this self-imposed discipline is beginning to cut seriously into the enormous profits long enjoyed by the British government and people from traffic in these articles. With the result that preachers of temperance, as a means of personal and national regeneration, are being arrested and severely punished! In the eyes of English officials in India, in other words, a spirit of self-reliance and efforts for self-improvement are crimes. It is treason to try to elevate people long enslaved by ignorance and force of arms.

In a recent exceedingly valuable article in *The Christian Register* (May 12), on "The Irish Question and the British Character," Rev. T. Rhondda Williams gives a reassuring survey of the liberal forces in England which are striving to make headway against the barbarous policies of the Lloyd-George government in Ireland. He speaks of the great campaign conducted by the Labor Party, which, he says, "has done more than any other party to make the English people acquainted with the real facts." He pays tribute to the work of "Mr. Asquith and some of the independent Liberals." Then he says, *"The churches are coming on slowly."* We wonder why in matters of this kind, involving the simplest moral principles and the most humanitarian ideals, it is always the churches that come on "slowly." Why should not they come on swiftly? Why should they not lead the van instead of always bringing up the rear? It surely is not because of ineffective organization. The churches can move like a prairie fire when they want to, as witness the action of the churches in this country on the Prohibition question, and the action of the Free Churches in England, a few years ago, on the issue of a prize fight in London. When a great problem comes along, however, involving political and economic factors of the largest consequence, and the freedom of great masses of the common people from exploitation, wretchedness and tyranny, the churches either take the side of tyranny, falter a few feeble protests, or else do nothing at all. There never was a clearer case for church action than the Irish issue. One does not have to believe in freedom for Ireland or support the policies of Sinn Fein to condemn the Lloyd George murders as the most unspeakable atrocities of modern times; and yet the great Anglican church has nothing to its credit in protest save the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords; and the Non-Conformist churches, recently charged with silence on the question, could say nothing in defence save that the Executive of the Free Church Council had passed a resolution condemning the Sinn Fein murders and the government reprisals. If the churches of England had any will or any power, they would have set England aflame, from end to end, and consumed the Lloyd George government in the wrath of an outraged people. As it is, they leave such work to the Labor Party, and themselves are contented to "come on slowly." If the Labor Party is Bolshevist, as many people contend, we are inclined to feel that there is some truth, after all perhaps, in George Lansbury's suggestion that the Bolsheviki are the really religious persons of our time.

The London *Daily Herald* tells of an English church, located in the little Essex village of Thaxted, about forty miles southeast of London, in which hangs the red flag of Soviet Russia, in a corner opposite the tri-colored emblem of the Irish Republic. The rector of this remarkable church is the Rev. Conrad Noel, one of the leaders of the Church Socialist League of Great Britain, and an outspoken champion of the Bolsheviki. He must be a good man to know and hear! As a parallel to this tale, may we rise and state that we have seen a church in the United States, in which hangs an honored portrait of Nicolai Lenin, the Premier of Soviet Russia. This is the First Baptist Church in Los Gatos, California, more popularly known as the Church of the Universal Fellowship. Its minister is the noble prophet and martyr, Rev. Robert Whitaker, who spent a part of the war period where all true Christians at such a time should properly have been, behind the bars of a prison. We wonder how much Dr. Whitaker's imprisonment had to do with the hanging of Lenin's portrait on the walls of his sanctuary! Which leads to persistent speculation as to the efficacy of persecution as a method of teaching people the error of their ways! How many persons, think you, were ever converted to orthodox opinions by being made the victims of legal power?

It was an impressive moment, at the recent Unitarian meetings in Boston, when, in the course of a discussion of amnesty for Mr. Debs, Rev. Henry W. Pinkham spoke the words of Jesus: "I was sick and in prison, and ye visited me not." It was a shocking moment when these words made no more impression upon the men and women who heard them in Boston, than they made when originally spoken by the Nazarene, upon the Pharisees who heard them in ancient Palestine. One would think that the hardest heart might be melted by the spectacle of a sick old man, guilty at the worst of nothing but an expression of minority opinion in war-time, facing a third hot summer behind the bars at Atlanta, Georgia. But no! Men and women who will spend these months in cool refreshment at Newport, or Mt. Desert, voted as blithely in opposition to this appeal for Christian mercy as they might throw a rat into the ash-bin. In our resentment, we found ourselves wishing that these Boston Unitarians might find themselves for a moment, like their ancestors in the seventeenth century, or their confreres today in Transylvania, a religious minority in the hands of tyranny, and be given a taste of that imprisonment for opinion's sake which they so willingly impose upon others. But we repressed this ugly feeling. We must have mercy even upon those who give none, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven!

Duty to Civilization

V.

The new year, 1914, was ushered in with many pacific utterances from liberal statesmen in Great Britain. Lloyd George, in an interview with the *London Daily Chronicle,* gave some reasons for the growth of armaments and expressed himself freely as to the cause of Germany's nervousness. He said that she had not only to consider France in her military and naval policy, but that she had also "to reckon with Russia on her eastern frontier." The publication of the interview caused something of a sensation in military and naval circles of the Entente Powers. The chauvinists of Russia and France were particularly bitter against the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for his speech seemed to be an indication that the British Government was getting rather tired of the costly business of preparing for "the inevitable war." Numbers of speeches were made by members of the Government against the enormous expenditure on armaments; the leaders of the opposition, however, carried on the agitation against Germany undeterred.

The real fact of the matter was that the Government had become thoroughly alarmed at its own policy. Grey spoke at Manchester, February 3rd, on international affairs and on armaments; in reviewing the naval position of the Powers, he said: "While British naval expenditure is a great factor in the naval expenditure of Europe, forces which are making that expenditure increase, generally are really beyond our control. I admit that we had some responsibility originally for building the first Dreadnaught. No doubt we are open to the criticism that we set the example."

The liberal party in the country had become extremely anxious and on several occasions it had shown a spirit of revolt against the Government's foreign policy. When Parliament met February 10th, the King's speech contained a striking reference to Anglo-German relations: "I am happy to say that my negotiations, both with the German Government and the Ottoman Government, as regards matters of importance to the commercial and industrial interests of this country and Mesopotamia, are rapidly approaching a satisfactory issue, while questions which have long been pending with the Turkish Empire in respect to regions bordering on the Persian Gulf, are in a fair way towards an amicable settlement." Perhaps no statement made by the Government on foreign affairs, since 1908, was received with so much satisfaction in Great Britain; the statement, however, was lamented bitterly in military and naval circles in Paris and St. Petersburg. The dispatches and letters of Count Benckendorff, the Russian Ambassador at London, to the Foreign Minister at St. Petersburg, reveal the condition in Russian diplomatic circles, as something very like panic at what was taking place

in London. The Entente for a while in the early spring of 1914 seemed to be in jeopardy; so to the Russian military party it was a case of "now or never." The *Golos Moskvy*, on March 12th, said:

> "The hatred towards Austria which has accumulated in the hearts of the Russian nation has long been seeking an outlet in war, and is only being kept back within the limits of the last degree of patience by the Russian Government with the utmost difficulty. But there is an end to all things. A moment may arrive when even the Russian Government will prove impotent to fight down the hatred towards Austro-Hungary which fills the Russian people, and then the crossing of the Austrian frontiers by the Russian army will become an unavoidable decision."

The organ of the Pan-Slavists, *Novoe Vremya*, March 7th, said: "The hour is approaching. . . . It is necessary to work on the Army from top to bottom, night and day." The London *Times* of March, 1914, contains in its dispatches from St. Petersburg enough journalistic dynamite relating to the war-like preparations of Russia to blow up the most pacific continent.

There were many reasons for both the military parties of France and Russia forcing the issue. Anglo-German oil interests had been at work for several years trying to draw the Governments together, so that they might seek the solution of the difficult problems connected with the Bagdad Railway and the oil areas of the Persian Gulf. Thanks to M. André Tardieu's statements, we now know that "a protocol was signed at the British Foreign Office in March, 1914, not only by the interested companies, but by Sir Eyre Crowe, representing the British Government, and Baron von Kühlmann, representing the German Government." Furthermore, we have M. Tardieu's statement that the British and German Governments strove until within five weeks of the outbreak of the war to settle their difficulties in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. He says:

> "On June 26th, 1914, the British Government, after negotiations of several years, carried through by its ambassador at Constantinople, Sir Lucas Malet, had obtained from the Sultan, for the benefit of an English Company, the Turkish Petroleum Company founded in March, 1914, the exclusive concession for petroleum discovered, or thereafter to be discovered, in the vilayets of Mosul and Bagdad. The Company consisted of seventy-five per cent British capital (the National Bank of Turkey, the D'Arcy group, the Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company) and twenty-five per cent German capital (the Deutsche Bank)."

What with Russian interests in Persia imperilled, and the French threatened with exclusion in the oil areas of Mesopotamia by the Anglo-German treaty, no wonder "the inevitable war" was precipitated by the militarists.

It is just as well to understand that every move taken by Serbia in the Balkans was made with the consent of Russia. Indeed the question of the Straits and Constantinople was not an isolated one in Russian policy; Serbia and Roumania were Russian pawns in the diplomatic game of forcing an entrance from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean. Mr. Bogitschevitch, the ex-Serbian attaché at Berlin, attributes the war to the Pan-Slav policy of Russia and Serbia. How far the Pan-Slavists wished to go with their imperialistic policy, so far as Serbia was concerned, is indicated in the interview Paschitch, the Serbian Premier, had with the Czar, February 2nd, 1914, when he declared that: "If it should be decided that we are to have the daughter of the Tsar of Russia for our Queen, she will enjoy the sympathy of the whole Serbian nation, and she will be able, if God and conditions permit, to become the Tsarina of the Southern Slav, Serbo-Kroatian people. Her influence and her luster will encompass the entire Balkan Peninsula." The *Pesterlloyd* and the *Budapesti Hirlap*, in reporting this interview, were under no doubt as to the close imperialistic and diplomatic associations of Serbia and Russia.

There is abundant evidence in the principal European journals of the spring of 1914 of how restless the Russian militarists had become. The story, pretty nearly complete, of Russia's preparations, down to the beginning of June, can be traced in the columns of the London *Times*. An article stated that Russia had raised her peace effectives by 150,000 men, "making a total peace strength of 1,700,000, or approximately double that of Germany." Then the writer of the article adds:

> "The Russian reply to Germany is next door to a mobilization in time of peace, and it quite accounts for the embittered outburst of the *Cologne Gazette*, and for the German pot calling the Russian kettle black. . . . There are signs that Russia has done with defensive strategy. . . . The increased number of guns in the Russian Army Corps, the growing efficiency of the Army, and the improvements made or planned in strategic railways are, again, matters which cannot be left out of account. These things are well calculated to make the Germans anxious."

In April, 1914, King George and Sir Edward Grey visited Poincaré in Paris, and there the last arrangements were made for the war. The documents from the Russian Foreign Office which contain the report of the Grey-Doumergue conference, show that the secret naval understanding with Russia was consummated, and that Sazenov had sound reasons for tell-

ing the Russian Duma that the friendship of the three Powers had been firmly established, *"irrespective of the form and scope of the written word."* How much the King and Sir Edward Grey knew when they visited Paris of Russian military preparations, and the warlike intentions of the Russian staff, no one seems to know; but it is safe to suggest that Grey knew that the Czar signed on February 19th, or 20th, 1914, an Ukase for the formation at Odessa of an expeditionary force which was to surprise and capture Constantinople in the near future. In an interesting letter to *Foreign Affairs,* Professor Fred C. Conybeare refers to the secret dispatches which passed between Paris and St. Petersburg over a month before the war, wherein the fact is mentioned that British ships had reached Kronstadt in pursuance of conveying Russian troops from that port to Pomerania, in accordance with Lord Fisher's favorite plan of campaign. In support of the statement in the Russian secret dispatches, Professor Conybeare relates how a Lloyd's agent at St. Petersburg received cable instructions from London before June 28th to go down to Kronstadt and report on the large fleet of merchantmen just arrived from England. "He found them, to his surprise, not full of freight, but empty; and on inquiry learned that they were to take Russian troops and land them in Germany."

After the return of Sir Edward Grey from the Paris conference in April, rumors were abroad of a deal that had been fixed up with the French and Russians. On April 28th, 1914, Grey was asked the following question:

> "Mr. King asked the Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that demands have been recently put forward for a further military understanding between the Powers of the Triple Entente with a view to concerted action on the Continent in the case of certain eventualities; and whether the policy of this country still remains one of freedom from all obligations to engage in military operations on the Continent?
>
> "The Secretary (Sir Edward Grey): 'The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative, and as regards the latter part the position now remains the same as stated by the Prime Minister in answer to a question in this House on the 24th March, 1913.'"

Then, on June 11th, two questions were put to the Foreign Minister:

> "Mr. King asked whether any naval agreement has been recently entered into between Russia and Great Britain; and whether any negotiations, with a view to a naval agreement, have recently taken place or are now pending between Russia and Great Britain?
>
> "Sir William Byles asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can make any statement with regard to an alleged new naval agreement between Great Britain and Russia; how far such agreement would affect our relations with Germany; and will he lay papers?
>
> "Sir Edward Grey: 'The hon. member for North Somerset asked a similar question last year with regard to the military forces, and the hon. member for North Salford asked a similar question also on the same day, as he has done again today. The Prime Minister then replied that, if war arose between European Powers, there were no unpublished agreements which would restrict or hamper the freedom of the Government or of Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should participate in a war. That answer covers both the questions on the paper. It remains as true today as it was a year ago. No negotiations have since been concluded with any Power that would make the statement less true. No such negotiations are in progress, and none are likely to be entered upon so far as I can judge. But if any agreement were to be concluded that made it necessary to withdraw or modify the Prime Minister's statement of last year, which I have quoted, it ought, in my opinion, to be, and I suppose that it would be, laid before Parliament."

It has been said that a certain amount of lying is absolutely necessary for a politician to indulge in in defence of his country, but secret diplomacy undoubtedly extended this branch of the art of juggling with the truth, by forcing British Ministers to lie in defence of foreign countries; still a Cabinet Minister's duty to civilization must be considered, though his policy is in accord with that of the Power, which was considered, not many years ago, to be inimical to Western Civilization.

The Archduke was murdered on June 28th. Whether the Entente diplomatic circles were much surprised or no, the royalties and peoples were amazed at "another exhibition of Serbian brutality." Some of the English papers were merciless in their criticism of the deed; and until within one or two days before the outbreak of the war, the House of Commons was told that "British interests in Serbia were nil." Serbia was held responsible until it became evident that the quarrel between Austria and Serbia could not be localized, and that a European conflagration was inevitable. What were the facts concerning the murder? Briefly, they are as follows:

> The plan to assassinate Franz Ferdinand was made in Belgrade.
>
> The bombs and Browning pistols used by the murderers were obtained in Belgrade.
>
> The bombs came from the Serbian arsenal at Kragujevac.

The findings of the court of inquiry were, of course, repudiated by Russia, and afterwards by the rest of the Allies; then any statement from Austrian sources on the subject was received with scorn. It was said neither Serbia nor Russia had anything whatever to do with the culprits. Now, of course, every intelligent student of foreign affairs knows that the findings of the court were correct, and that the murderers were Serbians, that they were members of the Pan-Slav movement.

About six months after the war came nominally to an end, the London *Star* published the following announcement: "The Serajevo murderers. A message from Prague to Amsterdam (says the Central News) announces that the bodies of Princip, Cabrinovic and Grabez, the Serajevo murderers, were exhumed on Tuesday with great solemnity in the presence of thousands of the inhabitants. The remains of these Serbian officers are to be sent to their native country." Miss Edith Durham, one of the best-informed students of Balkan affairs, writing to the London *Nation*, comments upon the Central News telegram as follows:

> "Up till now the Serbs have strenuously denied all connection with the murderers. It has been repeatedly stated that they were not Serbs, and the report was widely spread, and believed by many, that they were agents of the Kaiser, and had acted under German instruction. That German agents guilty of committing the deed which caused Europe to be swamped with blood and misery for four years should now be receiving public honors at the hands of the Serbs, would be one of the most astonishing events of history."

The facts in connection with the murder submitted by the Austrian Government to the Chancelleries in Europe are now known to have been substantially correct. Dispatch No. 3 in the British White paper shows clearly that the Austrian Ambassador at London acquainted Grey, July 23rd, with all particulars. The documents of the various Chancelleries show that Grey was fully informed of all that took place; indeed he knew of every diplomatic move made by the Powers. All the war-propagandist's yarns about his being taken by surprise by Austria and Germany can be relegated to limbo. Let us see what happened after the funeral of the Archduke. The first dispatch in the British White paper is dated July 20th, sent by Grey to the British Ambassador at Berlin, in which he records the conversation he had with Prince Lichnowsky, the German Ambassador at London. Why he should go to Berlin to get information on July 20th, when Sir Maurice de Bunsen, the British Ambassador at Vienna, had telegraphed him on the 16th, as follows: "As for myself, no indication was given me by Count Berchtold of the impending storm, and it was from a private source that I received on the 15th of July the forecast of what was about to happen, which I telegraphed to you the following day." Grey knew thoroughly well what was taking place in Vienna. He knew that on the 16th. It was not, however, until the 27th, when Bonar Law put an inspired question to him in the House, that he presumed to say anything. Then, as usual, he deceived the members by creating the impression that it was Friday, the 24th, when he received the first information of what was taking place. On the 28th, at question time, the Prime Minister was interpellated:

> Mr. Bonar Law: I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he has any information he can communicate on the European situation?
>
> Prime Minister: There is no new development sufficiently definite to enable any further statement to be made, but we hope that no unfavorable inference will be drawn from this. I cannot say more.
>
> Lord Hugh Cecil: Can the right hon. gentleman say if hostilities have have broken out?
>
> Prime Minister: We have no definite information about that.

Such was the pass to which secret diplomacy had brought the House of Commons. The work of deception and conspiracy had, however, to go on, though Mr. Asquith knew on the 28th of July that the British fleet sailed from Weymouth on the 25th, to "bottle-up the German Navy." Mr. Asquith also knew that every military preparation was being made at that moment for sending the Expeditionary Force to the Continent. He knew much more besides, for the British Ambassador telegraphed from Vienna on July 27th, "that a skirmish had already taken place on the Danube, in which the Serbians had been the aggressors." No doubt the British Ambassador at Vienna knew that Prince Alexander of Serbia telegraphed to the Tsar, that "the future of Serbia is secure now that it is the object of your Majesty's gracious solicitude." After 11 o'clock on July 28th, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs reported to the House the dispatch from Crackenthorpe, the British Ambassador at Nish, that war had been declared by Austria on Serbia. Then on July 30th, Sir Edward Grey communicated to the House that, "Austria has begun war against Serbia, and Russia has ordered a partial mobilization, which has not hitherto led to any corresponding steps by other Powers, so far as our information goes."

With regard to the Austrian note addressed to the Serbian Government on the 23rd of July, it seems to have been overlooked by the critics that the differences between Serbia and Austria were of long standing. The last phase dates from the annexation by Austria of Bosnia-Herzegovina, territory, under the

provisions of the Treaty of Berlin, ceded to Austria. Perhaps no more disgraceful bit of diplomatic work was ever carried out than that extension of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but it must not be forgotten that Isvolsky, the Russian Foreign Minister, was as much to blame for the business as Aerenthal, for he agreed in advance to the annexation. The allegations to the effect that Aerenthal, the Austrian Foreign Minister, bribed Isvolsky have never been disproved. Be that as it may, the Serbian and Austrian Governments came to an understanding March 31st, 1909, as to their future relationships. The Serbian Government declared:

> "Serbia recognizes that the *fait accompli* regarding Bosnia has not affected her rights, and consequently she will conform to the decisions that the Powers may take in conformity with article 25 of the Treaty of Berlin. In deference to the advice of the Great Powers, Serbia undertakes to renounce from now onwards the attitude of protest and opposition which she has adopted with regard to the annexation since last autumn. She undertakes, moreover, to modify the direction of her policy with regard to Austria-Hungary and to live in future on good neighborly terms with the latter."

From that time to the murder of the Archduke, Serbia was the Balkan hot-bed of secret societies fostered by the Pan-Slavs; and no similar case of the patience of a political State with misdemeanors against it permitted by a neighboring State, can be found readily in European history. For those who are familiar with the history of Mexico, China, Egypt, Tibet, Tripoli, Morocco, Ireland and South Africa, it is scarcely becoming in them to criticize the action of the Austrian Government in connection with Serbia.

The main provisions of the Austrian note of July 23rd, 1914, were well known in the Chancelleries of Europe long before the Archduke was murdered, and there is no excuse whatever why any statesman, or indeed, any professor of political science, should be ignorant of the declaration of the Italian Premier, Signor Gioletti, who said: "That the Marquis di San Giuliano, communicated to him that Austria wished to send in August, 1913, an ultimatum to Serbia, substantially identical with that sent last July."

Serbia and Austria seemed for some years to hang on the very precipice of war; indeed, it was thought a move in the wrong direction would bring about a conflict. Now, Brigadier-General Birdwood Thomson, a British general staff officer, who was at Grand Headquarters in France, can be accepted as an impartial critic. He went to the Balkans in the spring of 1914, and in his book, "Old Europe's Suicide," he says:

> "I reached Belgrade early in April, 1914. The city had resumed its normal aspect. The General Staff were talking and planning war, the general public was more interested in the working of the Commercial Convention with Greece. . . . I stayed in Vienna for a few days on my way to London. Here it was generally recognized that in regard to Serbia, a dangerous situation was developing, which could not be neglected. Many serious people frankly expressed the hope that some incident would occur which would provide a pretext for taking military action against the Serbs. No one wanted war, but everyone felt that an end had to be put to an intolerable state of affairs; the time for conciliatory measures had passed, the Southern-Slav movement was assuming menacing proportions, and would wreck the Austro-Hungarian Empire, if steps were not promptly taken to nip it in the bud."

In the account given in *L'Humanite* of the conversation which took place between Clémenceau and Poincaré about the Three Years' Law, it is stated that "the President gave him (Clémenceau) to understand that grave events were about to take place, that sooner or later the question of Austria will undoubtedly be raised, and that serious international complications would not fail to arise." This was never contradicted, though it caused something of a sensation in Paris. It is really amazing when one stops to think of the number of prophets that appeared in French and Russian diplomatic circles in the spring of 1914—unusual prophets, for they predicted war, and it came about over a quarrel which arose between Austria and Serbia, a quarrel at least five years old. Nobody puts the case in clearer terms than Lord Loreburn in his book, "How the War Came." He says:

> "Serbia gave offence to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, cause of just offense, as our ambassador frankly admits in the published dispatches. We had no concern in that quarrel, as Sir Edward Grey says in terms. But Russia, the protectress of Serbia, came forward to prevent her being utterly humiliated by Austria. We were not concerned in that quarrel either, as Sir Edward also says. And then Russia called upon France under their Treaty to help in the fight. France was not concerned in that quarrel any more than ourselves, as Sir Edward informs us. But France was bound by a Russian Treaty of which he did not know the terms, and then France called on us for help. We were tied by the relations which our Foreign Office had created, without apparently realizing that they had created them."

Civilization was hard put to it at the end of July, 1914, when secret diplomacy made it impossible for Ministers to tell the truth about entangling alliances.

(To be continued.) FRANCIS NEILSON.

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

III.

VICTOR HUGO.

Victor Marie Hugo, 1802-1885, was the son of one of Napoleon Buonaparte's generals, and grew to manhood in a most conservative atmosphere. As a boy he began to write poetry, and already as a youth he became famous as a poet, and had attracted attention as a novelist. Rapidly his mind developed, and gradually his conservatism, largely due to the influence of his mother, slipped from him, and by middle age he had become a republican and a radical. However, in the meantime he had been given a pension, made a Count, and become a member of the French Academy.

Dumas the elder said of Hugo that he was a great poet with a profound mind. Baudelaire saw in Hugo a great creative spirit, and one who gave a new meaning to literature. Coppee described him as the greatest lyric poet of all ages; and this was the opinion of Swinburne, who also saw in Hugo a redeemer and prophet. Swinburne said that Hugo was poet, dramatist, novelist, historian, philosopher, and patriot, "the spiritual sovereign of the nineteenth century, who was above all things a great poet."

Victor Hugo undoubtedly attained high rank as a poet and novelist. He also reached eminence as an orator, politician, and philosopher. He first gained fame as a lyric poet, however, and he has been regarded as one of the world's masters of lyric expression. Lyric poetry voices individual feeling, the interior life, and may be regarded as thoroughly individualistic in its nature and method of expression. With Hugo it has this personal quality, this utterance of the soul's joy, sorrow, regret, and aspiration. It is subjective, in the sense that the poet sees himself in all the world around him, in nature and in man alike. However, to Hugo the lyric cry, as it has been called, was not merely that of personal experiences, result of heartache or tragedy, joy or exaltation; but it interpreted as well the victories and the failures of universal human experience. In his poetical volumes entitled "Les Orientales," "Legends of the Centuries" (*La Legende des Siecles*), and "Songs of the Streets and Woods" (*Les Chansons des Rues et des Bois*), and others, he sings of what is universally human. Such a volume as the "Legends" describes man at the several stages of his social evolution, as interpreted in the folk-tales which reveal to us the inmost life of a period. Hugo sees man as thus in process of development, describes him as ever pushing forward, growing in purpose, and in mastery of himself. Here is lyric power, tragic experience, mastery of nature, and subjection of the brute in man.

The same tendency developed in Hugo's dramas, towards social as well as individual interpretation. Here we have not only conflict of individuals, antagonism of ambitions, clash of wills; but also conflicts of cultures, classes and systems of thought. Not only do men love and hate each other, contend for the same woman, desire the same ends of success; but there is clash of diverse moralities, antagonism of ideals, conflict of political standards, which cannot be reconciled with each other.

Hugo was to realize these clashings of social and political systems in his own personal experiences. He entered the French legislature, contended there for reforms, after he had come to accept republican and radical ideas. He became thoroughly humanitarian and altruistic in his political convictions. He strongly desired a republic, welcomed that of 1848, and came into a considerable degree of sympathy with the socialists, though he never actually allied himself with that party. He desired universal suffrage, a larger recognition of the demands of the workers, and pleaded for a juster and more humane administration of the laws. He contended with zeal for the abolition of capital punishment, wrote and spoke much on that subject, influenced legislation in behalf of it in France, Spain and Switzerland, and protested against the hanging of John Brown, predicting that if the sentence was executed it would divide the Union.

As a republican Hugo joined in the revolution of 1848, labored with enthusiasm for the establishment of the second republic, favored the election of Louis Napoleon to the presidency. When it became apparent that this adventurer was seeking by methods of intrigue and force to replace the republic with an empire, of which he was to be the emperor, Hugo turned against him with energy. When the traitorous deed was accomplished, though with the approval of a large majority of the French people, result of their fear of socialism, Hugo sought by all means to prevent its final consummation. He sought to arouse the workers, radicals and republicans, built barricades in the streets, made appeals to the people generally, with the hope of arousing them against the usurper. But the reactionary revolution had been too thoroughly organized in every possible direction, by bribing of officers, corruption of the soldiers, flattery of leading politicians, that no headway against it could be made. The empire became a fact and Louis Napoleon sat on a throne. When all was over Hugo escaped to Belgium, and then successively to Jersey and Guernsey. His exile lasted for twenty years, though it might have been terminated sooner had he been willing to accept the amnesty offered to all the exiles. Hugo preferred to remain away from his beloved Paris rather than concede anything to the empire.

In his exile Hugo made his protest against the usurpation brought about by Louis Napeoleon by means of the most detestable and tyrannical use of force. He at once wrote his book on "Naploeon the Little," and followed it by "Chastisements" (*Les Chatiments*), a volume of lyric poems. In these volumes Napoleon was scourged vigorously and held up to scorn and contempt. They were followed by the "History of a Crime" (*Histoire d'un Crime*), which was not published until 1877, when the downfall of Napoleon at Sedan had justified its appearance. In this book the whole story of the means by which the republic was transformed into an empire was told in detail. No incident was omitted, and no execration was overlooked.

During his years of exile Hugo retained his skill as a poet, nor did his dramatic work come to an end. This was the period when he wrote his great novels, however. In his earlier years he had written "Hans of Iceland" and "Bug-Jargal," and in 1831,

when he was twenty-nine, appeared "Notre Dame de Paris." This novel may be said to be the epic of Paris, and describes the city as centering its life about this great cathedral as representative of its institutional religion.

After he had settled in Guernsey Hugo produced his most important novels, "Les Miserables," 1862; "The Toilers of the Sea" (*Les Travailleurs de la Mer*), 1866; and "Ninety-three" (*Quatre-vingt-treize*), 1874. It is in the first of these works that we see Hugo at his best as a novelist. In it he follows the manner of "Notre Dame de Paris," only now it is France herself that is the great theme. In the earlier work the life centers about its greatest institution; but now it is France which finds the culmination of its life in the great cosmopolitan city, which represents its culture, its refinement, and its intellectual and spiritual power. It is evident that Hugo would have us think of Paris and France as representing what is greatest in the world's civilization, as giving light and leading to mankind. Here is culture, science, art, civilization, refinement and fashion at the highest expression mankind has reached.

Hugo brings many a character on the stage of this great book, some of them worthy of the highest degree of admiration, and others as darkly criminal and debased as it is possible to imagine. It is not these individuals, however, who afford the leading theme of the book; but rather it is French civilization in its varied phases. Personalities are here, indeed, and those worthy of the closest attention; but also there are classes, types of ethical life, struggles of contending systems, antagonisms of social ideals. In the good bishop the church appears at its best; but here are phases of the churchly system which are corrupt and evil. Men appear of lofty political purposes, but alongisde are men who use the state for their own selfish ends. In the five volumes of this novel every variety of human type finds its place, all sorts and conditions of men, women and children.

The title of the book is significant. It is not only the greatness of France Hugo would present, but he shows that underneath that greatness and glory is a misery that lurks everywhere. Civilization is noble in the church, in the legislature, in the army, and widely elsewhere; but The Wretched are not far away, and there are many of them. The streets, the buildings, the art, the schools are useful and beautiful; but underneath, hidden in alleys, in remote streets and houses, even in the sewers, are the criminal, the poor, the debased and the wretched. Civilization, when the veneer is removed, is far from attractive. Great and beautiful is the city, the center of the world's life; but hidden within is many a sore, corruption the most vile, debasement the most diabolical. Never are we free from The Wretched, the miserable, the hungry, the suffering, the ignorant. Civilization has made these creatures, as it has made the prosperous, the fashionable, the wise, and the godly. An essentially good man, typical of the soundness and uprightness of human nature, is thrust into the galleys, is hounded from place to place, takes refuge in the sewers, and is hunted as if he were a wild beast, because he has committed one of the pettiest of crimes. All society would seem to have conspired to prevent his recovery, his expiation. Jean Valjean shows us in his own person one of the limitations of our civilization, and one about which Hugo was much concerned. Society makes its criminals, and then it hunts them, and punishes them, in the most barbarous manner.

Perhaps the fact that the whole of France centers in Paris has given to the French people a recognition of social *solidarite* seen nowhere else. Here socialism had its beginnings, here revolution has had its most frequent and tragic expressions, and here republicanism has triumphed as nowhere else in Europe. For these reasons, it may be, Hugo presented in his poems and novels the life of a people rather than the experiences of individuals. Balzac, the Goncourts, preceded him in this tendency, and he has been followed by Zola and others.

Hugo's later novels have not reached the epic proportions of "Les Miserables," but they have shown the same kind of interpretation of social rather than of individual life. In "The Toilers of the Sea" the hero is the sea itself, and what it does to those who go down to it in ships. The sea sounds in every page of this novel, while men and women are but puppets in comparison with it. "Ninety-three" brings us into the midst of the revolution, the contention of classes, the struggles of the old and the new social systems.

Victor Hugo sees society as a whole, as well as in its classes and its individuals. There is no lack in his books of positive and very distinctive types of personal character; but there is also recognized those social, industrial and economic forces which are behind and determine the lives of all individuals. We may think that our wills and wishes are of supreme importance, that they shape all human thought and action, that their clashings with others give the substance of all art and literature; but Hugo suggests that the impersonal forces, the forces of society, are even mightier, and shape our lives to other ends than we aim at and desire. The real tragedies of life are not those of struggling individuals, but are found in our attempts to master nature, in the contentions of classes, and in the traditions coming from the past, with which we often contend in vain. Crime is with us, and vice, false ideals, and institutions which answer not to the needs of the present day.

It cannot be contended that Hugo made the most perfect use of these socially epical forces we find in the lives of individuals and nations. All we can claim is, that he has suggested a large and promising addition to literary productiveness. Life is ampler than any individual typifies, larger than any personal development realizes. In society are forces, possibilities, dynamic powers at work that only a vast future can bring to full expression. These are at work now, and out of them, and by means of them, the poet and the novelist—the artist in every kind—may secure the most worthy subject for his pen, his chisel or his brush.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

THE WATCH.

I do not sleep when others sleep;
I wait and wonder, watch and weep.
I make a little song in sorrow
For those to sing who come tomorrow.

In The Crisis. —*James Waldo Fawcett.*

The Spy System in Industry*

II.

Some of the most interesting evidence on the subject of Industrial Espionage is contained in an advertising booklet called "Industry, Society and the Human Element," published by one of the largest detective agencies in this country. This booklet constitutes such an amazing revelation of the methods and tactics of industrial detective agencies, that we reproduce herewith a large part of it. The preface reads as follows:

The aim is to state, from a practical standpoint, what may be done to stop unrest in the industrial, social and moral life of any organization. *The illustrations are truthful occurrences.*

We read further:

In April, 1910, Mr. ——— organized the business which has since borne his name. His goal was to have the best prepared, safest, and most efficient detective organization in the country.

Its whole work consists in promoting harmonious relations in the industrial and social world, thereby preventing the uprisal of discordant conditions.

. . . Why does the world need us? *Because we work for the betterment of mankind in general* . . . honorably seeking proper co-operation between employer and employe . . . in an effort to obtain simple justice. . . . .

. . . Because we promote Harmony in Industry, ——— Service cannot but help to be for the good of all—it is honest, earnest endeavor to do as we would be done by. . . .

Under the "Method of Operation" the following is not without interest:

There was a certain amount of successful work accomplished in discouraging the thought of organization. One of the operatives was assigned to cultivate and devote his attention to the organizer, and to win his personal and sincere association. Each shift in the factory was thoroughly covered at all times by talking convincingly to the men during working hours, truthfully stating to storekeepers and calling their attention to the fact that money would be lost should their customers be out on strike, working upon the relatives and friends of the employees and swinging the wives and children over to reasons for harmony, and showing to everybody affected that the money spent for the proposed union would undoubtedly be used to support and maintain an easy life for the organizers.

The following two weeks our operatives were *successful in being able to take over virtually the entire management of the proposed union.*

The booklet describes the method used in another case:

———† Quick Strike Service. Strike Called Off in Eight Days.

Recently the employees of one of the very largest companies in the East went out on strike for a ten per cent increase. We were called into the case, and as the company was very busy, having many contract orders at the time, they were forced to try to make a settlement with the strikers.

An Italian operative was assigned to work on this case, and a short time after his arrival he succeeded in getting the men back to work. Before our operative's arrival the strikers had formed a union which was affiliated with an organization of anarchistic tendencies.‡ The company was determined to exterminate this body, but were unable to do so at the time. We were given full authority to act and told to follow our own methods in breaking up the union. We learned that plans had been made to oppress the company by continuous exorbitant demands.

Immediately, two Italian operatives and one Polish operative were dispatched to the locality—one to cultivate the secretary of the union who was a very violent anarchist‡—one to cultivate an Italian employee who had a great amount of influence over his fellow countrymen and who up to the time of the operative's arrival had been taking a very active part in the organization's affairs—while the Polish operative was to cultivate the Polish president of the union.

Unknown to each other in any way, the three secured positions in the plant, conducting themselves as ordinary laborers, living with their respective countrymen.

The employees had several clashes with the company, many of these resulting whenever the company would discharge one of the men. In each instance the company, at our advice, gave in to the men, because we realized that the time had not arrived to strike a decisive blow.

The Italian operative assigned to cultivate the secretary was successful in getting that official to resign his position and seek employment elsewhere. Unable to hold his position, however, he shortly returned and demanded his reinstatement. In the meantime the other operatives were using such arguments as would tend to discourage the men on account of the action of their leaders, calling attention to the fact that the secretary had deserted them by eagerly accepting a position which netted him, alone, personal gain, and by the time the secretary had returned we had been successful in splitting the union into three factions—one controlled by the committee, one by a Polish leader, and one by the president. The secretary demanded that he be given his former job, and also reinstated in his old position. A meeting was called for the purpose, and the Italian employee whom our operative had been cultivating and influencing, fought against the secretary. The action resulted in the Polish president of the union resigning his position, as he was too indignant against the secretary on account of the arguments which our operatives had used on him. A meeting that was held for the purpose of settling these matters resulted in a general fight. However, a few members of the committee proved to their associates that the secretary was entitled to recognition, and he, with renewed authority, was successful in proving to the men that they were entitled to more consideration from their employers, and a strike was immediately declared, with the result that all the workers went out, and we realized that the proper time had arrived to exterminate the trouble-making organization, and advised our client accordingly. We were told to see the whole matter through to a finish.

We detailed a number of guards, under the command of recognized officers from our regular staff, and they were immediately deputized and kept the strikers from congregating in the vicinity of the mill. Ejectment papers were served upon the committee, who were from another town, and they were ordered to leave town, which they did. Our secret operatives in the meantime were using such arguments as would tend to cause further dissension in the ranks.

Result.

At the end of eight days the Italians had given up the fight. Our Polish operative had succeeded in having all the Poles employed call a secret meeting at which they agreed to return to work. When the Italians heard of this fact, they also called the strike off and returned. As they entered the factory they threw their books and buttons into a rubbish can which we had placed near the entrance for that purpose.

The Labor Spy makes the most of race hatred, and capitalizes upon every conceivable fear and prejudice. He is particularly able to do this in those industries in which large scale production predominates, and where the percentage of foreign born is very high. We read the following:

Our Polish operatives circulated stories among their countrymen to the effect that the Italians intended to return to their work, so that they might gain the attention of their bosses in such a way as to secure the better positions when all returned.

This agency boasts that—

We are serving hundreds of leading concerns throughout the country, many of which are the largest in the United States.

. . . The ——— Detective Agency *seeks the association of the business executive in a strict ethical manner!*

Let us consider now briefly the case for and against Industrial Espionage. The ardent supporters of the

*Study made for the Student Liberal Club of Harvard University.
†Name of detective agency.
‡The free use of such terms as "anarchistic," "radical," etc., by detective agencies is to be discounted as they tend to brand even conservative labor movements as radical. In fact the word "radical" is used with very little discrimination.

system claim that industrial spies are sometimes successful in increasing production. This argument, however, seems to have very little foundation. It would seem to the writer that there are sounder ways of increasing production than by producing suspicion and hatred, and by breaking down the confidence upon which society is so firmly founded.

There are times, however, when the industrial spy reports the activties of an overbearing foreman, whereupon he may or may not be reprimanded and the abuses corrected. Our more conservative friends would argue that it is one of the strongest points of the managers of the various detective agencies, that the labor spy is successful in getting radicals and agitators out of the industry. This again is extremely fallacious and shallow. If there are "agitators" in industry, there must be some reason why they are there. If there is discontent in industry, the way to root it out is not by underhand methods. The so-called "agitator" almost always has a grievance, and the most thorough way to do away with the nuisance that he causes is by finding out the causes of the discontent, not by using suppressive methods.

Industrial Espionage as a system can be indicted on a number of counts, all of which seem to the writer to be sound. The first one is the futility of the whole system, which results from the mere character of the men who operate it. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the man whose business it is to be a professional liar would not hesitate to use the same methods of conduct in his contact with his employer. Men who are recruited from the streets, from cheap hotels and employment agencies, are not likely to be the most dependable workers.

More and more employers are beginning to realize that the use of industrial spies is not good business. They are beginning to become aware of the fact that many of the spies' daily reports are exceedingly childish in nature, and that they do not solve his problems.

One of the strongest arguments against the labor spy is that he gets very little at great expense. The "Sherman Dollar," for example, a small advertising "coin" issued by the Sherman Service of Boston, shows that during the first six months of 1920 they spent for the benefit of their "clients," as they term it, $1,-110,314.87. This agency is only one of hundreds throughout the country. It is impossible to estimate the amount of money which has been spent in the last few years by employers for the services of industrial spies.

There tends to be no end to the matter of spying. Many spies are indeed so untrustworthy that it becomes necessary to set spies on the spies to see that they are doing their work. The manager of one agency in Boston, for example, told the writer he had one of his men on the job during a strike on one of the docks of Boston about a year ago. He began to realize that one of the operatives was not sending in very complete reports and he began to get suspicious. Upon investigation he found out that his man was also in the employ of another agency in Boston. Is not distrust the reward of distrust?

Spies have to earn their salaries whether there is anything to report or not; hence they tend to become "agents provocateurs." If a spy has nothing to report, there is a tendency for him to send in a verbose report anyway; and while it is not common, it has happened that he has stirred up trouble in order to get something to report.

To use the words of Professor Richard Cabot, chairman of the Department of Social Ethics in Harvard University, "Industrial Espionage is a rotten system, because it contains the elements of its own decay." Professor Cabot believes that Industrial Espionage is like a piece of rotting wood being consumed by the elements within it. He considers the system a declaration of war, without a cause for war. The system, too, is ethically indefensible. "Confidence," he says, "is one of the classic sensitive points in human character. Confidence is only as strong as its weakest link, and when broken down the suspicion which follows tends to spread like hysteria."

The working man who is the victim of the labor spy tends to jump to the conclusion that every employer is using the same system, which is, of course, far from the truth. The effects of the suspicion caused by spies reach very far into the social fabric, indeed so far and so penetratingly that it is almost impossible to find its limits. Undoubtedly no small part of the suspicion in the labor movement of one group by another is an after-effect of the suspicion caused by labor spies. Labor, too, has spied on labor spies but has found it of little value. One cannot easily spy on the board of directors.

The labor spy is also an important factor in the strong antagonistic feelings aroused in labor groups during strikes. The spy's usual method of promoting kindly feelings toward the employer is by causing hatred of the labor leader, as if such a stupid method could in the long run really gain him anything.

The general distrust caused by a man being a traitor to his group is by no means a small factor in the matter.

Thomas Mott Osborne, the great prison reformer, says that some criminals have told him that it is the ethics of their profession not to squeal on a pal. Whatever we may think of this standard of ethics, it is most certainly true that the labor spy has something to learn from some of our criminals.

The whole system seems to be the result of ignorance, on the part of the employer, of the psychology of the average worker. His prejudices and fears have been played upon by scheming detective managers, and he has been literally bled of millions of dollars as a result of it. The industrial spy system is a very poor substitute for decent, healthy, industrial relations. It is indeed hard to predict just what the future of the system will be. As the writer sees it, the extermination of Industrial Espionage depends almost entirely upon the enlightenment of public opinion. Little is to be expected from our legislators in this regard, and employers will be loathe to give it up. Light seems to be the factor which will be strongest in sending the system to its deserved doom.

The liberalization of labor policies, the humanization and education of employers and, on the part of the workers, a sympathetic understanding of the problems of larger scale management are also important factors in the remedy.

As the *New Republic* says:

> To anyone who sincerely believes in a co-operative spirit between labor and capital, this vast, insinuating system of bad will, provocation, corruption and violence is an intolerable obstacle to industrial peace.

If industry is to evolve peacefully; if it is to become gradually more humanized, more democratic, one of the first prerequisites is the abolition of the spy system.

NORMAN E. HIMES.

The Cry of Armenia

[EDITORIAL NOTE: We print, herewith, a document by Mrs. Diana Agabeg Apcar, an Armenian woman who lives in Yokohama, Japan, as the representative of the Armenian Republic.

This document was sent to us by an American woman intimately in touch with the Armenian situation who in a private letter writes as follows: "Mrs. Apcar expresses herself very frankly and forcibly, as you will see; and her articles will help to make known some of the revolting things that have been permitted to happen in the Near East under Allied domination. She can still find words with which to condemn these crimes, so far as the guilt is European, but very probably for the sake of policy she lets the United States off. I feel very sure though that she realizes quite as keenly as I do our own enormous guilt in the matter. . . . The Allies solemnly promised during the war that the Turks' rule should end! Now he is more oppressive than ever because he finds that they really do not mean it. I should hate to be one of their trembling victims tonight. . . . To (all) who try to gloss over Turkish iniquities of Armenian and Greek rights, I would say, Leviticus-like, 'Thou shalt not expect the broken and plundered and raped and tortured to live side by side with their persecutors. It is confusion. It is abomination. I am Jehovah.' . . .

"Will you not through UNITY make appeal to the President? Possibly other papers will follow you."

UNITY is in full sympathy with this stirring protest against the horror of the present Armenian situation. The failure to bring relief to the Armenians is a perfect example of the failure of the Allies to make the war serve the purpose to which they profess to dedicate it. The Great War, as we all now see, was futile because of the insincerity of those who fought it; and in no direction is its futility more cruel than in that of Armenia.

Our correspondent urges that two things be done by America. First, in the name of charity, we should continue, and if possible increase, the money which we are giving to the Near East Relief Association. This work must go on in a far greater spirit of generosity, for the Armenians need help today as much as they ever needed it in the past. Secondly, in the name of justice the American government should undertake to use its utmost influence to secure the emancipation of Armenia from Turkish rule. "Are we not in a position," she says, "to put the screws on the Allies financially if they continue to ignore their obligations."

The immediate menace is twofold: that of the utter abandonment of the Armenians to the Turks under an agreement with Kemil; and that of a fresh invasion of the Republic by Bolshevik forces. Inaction in this case on the part of the American people who for a generation have been familiar with Armenian atrocities would seem to be much longer impossible. —J. H. H.]

AN OUNCE OF JUSTICE WORTH MORE THAN A TON OF CHARITY

Through decade after decade of national agony the Armenians have asked for justice. They have cried to the powerful governments of Europe "Give us Justice!" but the ears of Imperialistic Europe could never be open to such a cry, and the long drawn out agony of Armenia continued without ceasing.

Despairing of ever obtaining Justice from Europe; realizing that the very policies pursued by the powerful governments of Europe were ruthlessly and mercilessly destroying their national life, they turned to the great Christian power of the new world and made anew their despairing appeal: "Give us Justice!"

The great free powerful Democracy of the West (God bless her. God bless her always will be the prayer of every Armenian heart) gave us instead *Charity*. But we ask for *Justice*. And even now at the eleventh hour, if the great powerful Democracy of the West will demand Justice for Armenia and the Armenians, the "Allies" will hear and tremble.

The near Eastern policies of the great Powers of Europe resulted in the desolation of Armenia and in the annihilation of half the Armenian race. In the face of such actual enormous injuries we have had to swallow the bitter pills of insult wrapped in the silver paper of sophisticated language proclaiming to the world the visionary benefactions that the great powers of Europe have never bestowed upon the Armenians.

"Give us Justice," is our cry. We do not ask it of imperialistic European governments because experience has taught us that we will never receive Justice from them; but we ask great America, freedom-loving, democratic America to demand of Europe that Justice which we have not the power to seize for ourselves, since our enemies are too many and too powerful, and they fall upon us and destroy what we build or try to build.

America has given us Charity through the Near East Relief, but as far as the Armenians are concerned the Near East Relief has been pouring water into a sieve, because our enemies make larger and more gaping wounds than the wounds that the Near East Relief binds. The effective work would be to prevent the infliction of new wounds on the Armenian national body. As an instance of this point we can illustrate what French policy has accomplished in Cilicia. Since the signing of the Armistice the losses of the Armenians in that southernmost province of Armenia on the Mediterranean coast, one might even say under cover of the guns of the British fleet, total from forty to forty-five thousand massacred, and several thousand deported, cast adrift and made homeless anew. For these horrors the French, and the French alone, are responsible.

The French brought regiments of Mohammedan soldiers into Cilicia, Senegalese, Algerians and such others, and these went over in a body with their rifles to their co-religionists, the Turks. The Armenian volunteers were bravely and successfully defending the Armenian population, but the French command wilfully disbanded and disarmed them, and every Armenian was prohibited from possessing a rifle under penalty of death.

Could a more murderous plan calculated for destroying a Christian people be conceived than this plan conceived and organized in Paris?

It also made possible the Kemalist attack on the territory of the Armenian Republic, for with this force of deserters from the French army, trained, armed and equipped, the military strength of the Turks was vastly increased.

Turkish attack on the west front of the territory of the Armenian Republic became the signal for the Tartar attack on the east. This was a natural result to be expected, and it is not possible that the French government had failed to foresee it.

The "Allies" who have proved so forceful and exacting towards Germany have been lenient to criminality in their dealings with the Turks. They are tak-

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

REV. ROBERT WHITAKER RESIGNS.

Rev. Robert Whitaker, who has served the Los Gatos Church of the Universal Fellowship for the past twelve years, has tended his resignation to the members of this church, to take effect Sunday, June 12th.

At a recent meeting of the church the wishes of this widely known pastor to resign were considered by the members and accepted. About six weeks ago Reverend Whitaker suffered an attack of pneumonia, which has left him unable to carry on the work. Under the advice of a physician he is to go to the mountains of Southern California, where it is hoped the higher altitude will prove beneficial.

For more than a quarter of a century Reverend Whitaker has been widely known on the Pacific Coast. Minister in Salem, Ore., Oakland and Palo Alto and Los Gatos, associated with the Universal Fellowship movement for ten years, he is one of the best known ministers in this section of California.

Rev. Arthur B. Heeb, who has been associated with the Los Gatos church for some months, has been elected to assume the pastorate. Some time ago Rev. J. Covington Coleman, who was also associated with this church, resigned, thus leaving but one minister now in charge, Reverend Heeb.

It is hoped on the part of Reverend Whitaker to continue the Fellowship work, which numbers correspondents in many of the countries of the world. The headquarters may be moved to Santa Barbara or some other Southern California city. In view of the educational nature of this work, strengthening the forces of World Fellowship, the members of the Los Gatos church have asked Robert Whitaker to retain the title of Chancellor, an office of the old foundation of the cathedral church, which had to do with education.

Accompanied by Mrs. Whitaker, he has left for an automobile trip of Southern California.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENT.

If the Churches have hitherto been interested in the amelioration of poverty, in the combatting of social disease, in the protection of women and children in industry, in the still broader issues confronting our entire industrial civilization, they have now the opportunity to work for the advancement of all these separate causes by a concentrated effort in behalf of that world peace with which our social problems are bound up.

To fight for a reduction of armaments is to fight for civilized standards in industry, for a higher standard of living, for cleaner and more efficient government, for the protection of women and children, and for a great many other practical values. War brings social unrest, economic collapse, unemployment, destitution, broken homes and broken lives. The Churches can render no greater service than is involved in an unrelenting campaign against the basic cause of so much of the world's misery and discontent.—*Simon Strunsky.*

The Churchman.

---

ing care to cripple Germany whilst they are strengthening and fattening the Turks.

France is the creditor of sixty per cent of Turkish indebtedness. England is seeking to ingratiate herself with the Moslems of India and to win their favor in order to balance them against the Hindoos who are chafing against British rule in Britain's great dependency. Further, the loss of Syria and Mesopotamia acquired by France and Britain require to be offset, and so once more the Armenians are made the great sacrifice.

When the Armistice was signed the Turks were under the feet of the "Allies," but the "Allies" are now trying to persuade the world that the so-called "Turkish Nationalists" are as powerful as Hindenburg's army was. The "Allies" could put down all Turkish lawlessness if they wished; but they do not wish to do so, nor will they ever do it unless public opinion in America crystallizes into a demand that they should. The "Allies" are trying to nullify the Sevres Treaty, to which they are signatories, and the terms of which it was their most sacred duty to ratify, nor do we hear or read of denunciations in the Allied countries of a Treaty being made into "a scrap of paper."

Events have now proved also that all the American missionary efforts in the Near East have been expended for nothing, since no Mohammedans have been converted to Christianity during the space of half a century, but on the contrary they have become more fanatical and more hostile towards Christianity and Christains than ever they were before; and as for the unfortunate Christians of Armenia and Asia Minor they have been ruthlessly destroyed owing to the policies of the powerful governments of Europe. Between the Christians that have survived the Moslem onslaught and the Mohammedans, the bitterest hatred now exists. It is a natural feeling which cannot be overcome.

Asia Minor and Armenia belong to the Greeks and Armenians. By sheer force and sheer force alone the Turks have usurped these lands they have desolated, to the possession of which they have no right. They have subjected the Christian peoples whose countries they have robbed to fearful oppressions; they have perpetrated on them the most horrible and revolting atrocities, confident in that immunity from punishment of their crimes resultant from the jealousies and rivalries of the great powers of Europe. There has been nothing recorded in history so appalling as the frightful atrocities that the Turks recently perpetrated on defenceless Armenians irrespective of sex or age.

This is the plain story of the hideous past put into a few words.

The idea that the Armenians must help themselves does not apply to us; for the Armenians did help themselves; they established a republic under the most tragic and abnormal circumstances; they governed wisely and well for two and a half years; they progressed although battling with acute economic distress; but enemies attacked the newly established State from all sides and overwhelmed the government and made ruin and economic distress anew.

We now ask for a new era in our history, for a free and independent Armenian State on whose soil the Armenian people can live and work out their own salvation.

Every nation has a right to its own independent existence. Every nation has a right to country and a national home.

Armenians ask for a free and independent national home. Sorely tried Armenia asks of great and powerful America to make 1921 the year of emancipation and stability for Armenia.

Armenia belongs to the Armenians. We ask that our country, or at least such a portion of it as will ensure the economic life of our people be given to us and secured to us.

Justice is like the sun in the heavens. It does not require telescopes to be seen.

We ask for Justice.

London, England. DIANA AGABEG APCAR.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -